



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Han

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,895	06/21/2001	Carl N. Baron	NOR/1006	6116
37172	7590	02/09/2006	EXAMINER	
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP (NORDSON)			OSMAN, RAMY M	
2700 CAREW TOWER				
441 VINE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CINCINNATI, OH 45202			2157	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/886,895	BARON, CARL N.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ramy M. Osman	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed December 20, 2005. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/2005, with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-7 have been considered but are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues that in contrast to Baker (US Patent No 5,696,898) "Applicants invention does not determine which URLs may be transmitted from a user terminal to a public network for access the web server".

*In reply*, Applicant has failed to indicate which specific claim limitations are not taught by Baker. The Baker reference teaches restricting user access to selected URLs (see rejection that follows below).

4. Applicant argues that "URLs are transmitted on the network without restriction" in applicants invention.

*In reply*, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., URLs are transmitted on the network without restriction) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims are broad and only mention that a user is unrestricted in accessing a plurality of web screens. This is inherently taught by Baker, since a user is unrestricted in accessing the full URLs it is allowed to access (column 3 lines 54-67 and column 4 lines 7-15).

Art Unit: 2157

5. Applicant argues that the invention contrasts with Baker because the invention teaches that “access of the user to selected published web screens.. is restricted based upon the identified address of the user”.

*In reply*, this limitation is taught by Baker. Baker discloses determining the identity of the requesting user terminal in order to restrict its access to particular URLs (column 3 lines 54-67 and column 4 lines 7-15).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-3 and 5-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos et al (US Patent No 6,282,454) in view of Baker et al (US Patent No 5,696,898).**

8. In reference to claims 1 and 5, Papadopoulos in view of Baker teaches a method of regulating network access to selected functions of a controller of a machine, comprising:

Coupling a controller of a machine to a network having a web server configured to publish a plurality of web screens configured to control the selected functions of the controller, the controller being operatively coupled to and independent of the web server (Abstract, column 2 lines 33-60, column 3 line 47 – column 4 line 6 and column 4 lines 20-45);

Publishing web screens on the network via the web server for receipt by at least one remote computer coupled to the web server via the network (column 2 lines 33-60, column 3 line 47 – column 4 line 6 and column 4 lines 20-45);

Although Papadopoulos teaches secure user access and authorizing user access (column 4 lines 12-20 and column 9 lines 55-65), he fails to explicitly teach identifying a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network; and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user. However Baker teaches an access control method that restricts specific users of accessing the a computer system. Baker discloses identifying a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network (column 1 lines 43-50 & 56-67, column 3 lines 38-52, column 4 lines 14-40, and claim 1); and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user (Summary, column 3 lines 38,39 & 50-52, column 3 line 64 – column 4 line 5, column 4 lines 14-35 and column 5 lines 6-15 & 25-50).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Papadopoulos by identifying a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network; and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user as per the teachings of Baker for the purpose of an access control method that restricts specific users of accessing the a computer system.

Art Unit: 2157

9. In reference to claims 2 and 6, Papadopoulos in view of Baker teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein a user accessing the web server via the at least one remote computer is restricted in access to a subset of the plurality of published web screens (Baker: Summary, column 3 line 64 – column4 line 5, column 4 lines 14-35 and column 5 lines 6-15 & 25-50).

10. In reference to claims 3 and 7, Papadopoulos in view of Baker teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein a user accessing the web server via the web server is unrestricted in access to the plurality of published web screens (Baker: Summary, column 3 line 64 – column4 line 5, column 5 lines 6-15).

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2157

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO  
February 3, 2006



ARIO ETIENNE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER